UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01989184 5

CANADA AND THE JESUITS.

BY

JOSEPH WILD, D.D.

BX
1767
.W5
SMC

CANADA AND THE JESUITS

BEING A

SERIES OF SIX SERMONS

DELIVERED BY

JOSEPH WILD, M.A., D.D.

Pastor of the Bond Street Congregational Church, Toronto, Canada,

AUTHOR OF

"THE TEN LOST TRIBES," "HOW AND WHEN THE WORLD WILL END," "TALKS FOR THE TIMES," "SUNDAY MORNING SERMONS," ETC.

TORONTO, CANADA:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE "CANADIAN ADVANCE."

10½ ADELAIDE STREET EAST.

TITLES OF SERMONS.

PAGE

The Jesuits 9

What to Do With the Jesuits 20

What the Jesuits Will Do 34

Great Britain and Protestantism and Our Duty 46

St. Patrick and Ireland 56

God, the Queen, and the Pope 68

PREFACE.

MUCH has been said of late about the Jesuit Oath. It is difficult to say exactly which is the correct one out of the several presented, though none of them differ very much.

I think, however, the most trustworthy one is that given below. It is taken from the book, "Secret Instructions of the Jesuits," published by Thomas E. Leyden. Any one consulting this book will find his authority; to me it appears satisfactory.

J. W.

THE JESUIT'S OATH.

I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, the Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul and the saints and Sacred Host of Heaven, and to you my ghostly father, I do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that the Pope is Christ's Vicar General and is the true and only Head of the universal church throughout the earth, and that by virtue of the Keys of binding and loosing given to His Holiness by Jesus Christ he hath power to depose Heretical Kings, Princes, States, Commonwealths and Governments, all being illegal without his sacred Confirmation, *and that they may safely be destroyed.* Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and His Holiness's rights and customs against all Usurpers of the Heretical or Protestant Authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended Authority and Church in England and all Adherents, in regard that they be usurped and heretical, opposing the Sacred Mother Church of Rome.

I *do Renounce* and disown *any Allegiance* as due to any heretical King, Prince or State, named Protestant, or obedience to any of their *inferior Magistrates or Officers*.

I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots and other Protestants, to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist and advise all or any of His Holiness's agents, in any place wherever I shall be, and to do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended power, regal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the propagation of the Mother Church's interest to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any one of this convent.

All which I, A. B., do swear by the Blessed Trinity, and Blessed Sacrament which I am about to receive, to perform, on my part to keep inviolably; and do call on all the Heavenly and Glorious Host of Heaven to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony whereof, I take this most Holy and Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent.

INTRODUCTION.

This little book is sent forth to meet a demand. I have preached six sermons on Jesuitism, in which the public seem to be interested.

The *Canadian Advance*, which prints weekly my Sunday evening discourses, issued extra editions, but they were all sold, and inquiries and demands for the sermons came in from many places. This being the case, I thought it best to give to the public this small volume. I hope it will do good and help on the agitation to a reasonable and peaceable result.

My church is always full, but if it were possible it has been fuller during the delivery of these discourses. The three thousand packed inside were thought to be fortunate by the hundreds who failed to gain admission.

The Jesuit question is a very important one for a young and growing country like Canada. It is a pity that Pope Clement's Bull of Annihilation of this Order was not more effective. The existence of the Order in Canada goes to show and prove the weakness and contradiction of Popes. Such things present the doctrine of infallibility in a poor light—in fact, argumentatively, they upset it completely.

On July 11th, 1773, Pope Clement XIV. signed the Bull of extinction, but durst not proclaim it from his Vatican throne till about two o'clock on the morning of July 23rd. At that time the Jesuits in St. Peter's were all in their rooms. Then order was given to fasten the doors and keep them there. In the middle of the night the Conclave assembled, the Pontiff ascended his throne and made the proclamation. This done,

the bells rang and told the sleeping thousands that some great deed had been done in St. Peter's. The Jesuits for once were caught napping.

Pope Clement said when he signed the document, "It will cost me my life, but I must abolish this dangerous Order." September 22nd, 1774, his prophecy came true. On his death-bed he said, "I am going to Eternity, and I know for what."

Rightly or wrongly, history credits the Jesuits with many such foul and dastardly acts. Charity stretched to the uttermost leaves them very suspicious and of bad reputation.

My own idea is, that neither God, the Church, the State, nor man needs such a society. I hope they will be suppressed in Canada. In a lawful and Christian way I will do all I can in that direction.

These sermons have been reported by Thomas Pinkney, who for several years has proved himself a faithful, good workman. I have left them as he presented them. The reader will make due allowance for want of style and finish in my addresses; I have tried to be faithful and accurate. May the Good Lord bless my weak endeavour to His praise and glory.

JOSEPH WILD.

Toronto, March 29th, 1889.

CANADA AND THE JESUITS.

THE JESUITS.

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.—GAL. v. 1.

LIBERTY is a pleasant thing to enjoy, but a hard thing to keep. We find by experience, when put into the hands of a man, or men, that it has a very ready tendency to generate tyranny. Looking at liberty through the Gospel we find that it implies a certain kind of equality, which equality is authorized by the brotherhood of man, whose very foundation is in the fatherhood of God, and Who, in His inspired Word, tells us that He is no respecter of persons. As British subjects, we recognize no temporal power higher than, or equal to, that of our own beloved Queen. As spiritual creatures, we acknowledge no authority or head but Jesus Christ. Nay, we will not allow our own beloved and honoured Queen to take the place of Jesus in the realm of our conscience, much less a Pope, a Cardinal, an Archbishop, a Bishop, a priest, a minister, an elder, or a deacon. We believe what our Saviour said, as recorded in Matt. xxiii. 8: "But be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your Master, *even* Christ; and all ye are brethren." No man in this brotherhood is gifted with authority or called to lord and rule over God's

heritage. On the worldly side of our existence we may have titles, but on the spiritual side, no man should assume supremacy or have a title that would imply that he is a special custodian of spiritual graces and sacraments, and that unless he grants us favours we are lost. No man on God's earth can damn me. All the Churches put together cannot do it. I am my own keeper in the sight of my God, and you are equally obligated in that same sense. Blessing and curses have no more power than that which is given to them by the piety and loving devotion to God and truth of the individual, be the same a Pope or an humble layman. I would dread the curse of a poor Irishman as much as that of a Pope. Unless he be superior in virtue and have more of the love of God in his heart than the poor Irishman I am speaking of, neither his curses nor his prayers could be as effectual. Truths of so simple a kind we would naturally think every sensible person would accept, did we not know from history to the contrary.

In our asylums we have patients who think they are kings and queens and lords, and as far as they can they conduct themselves in accordance with their own insane fancies and seem to enjoy it. But there are persons outside of the asylums who act just as funnily and presume equally as much. They would have you believe they were Christ's vice-gerents commissioned of the Lord, with great spiritual privileges that they will sell you on certain conditions. They have no such article for sale and they have no such authority given them. Take, for instance, the bombastic Bull of Pope Boniface VIII., called *Unum Sanctum*. He says: "We declare, define and pronounce it to be necessary to the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." Now, if I literally believed that, with

the stubborn British heart I have I would never go to Heaven. I thank God I don't believe a bit of it. In fact, I would rather take my chances by not believing such foolishness, and would get a better chance by disbelieving it if I were put really to the test. A man who can be so blasphemously presumptive, if he had it in his power would not hesitate to fence in the sun, bottle up the light, chain the tides of old ocean, and charge us for our water and the air we breathe.

I am glad they are men of pretension only. Men of such pretensions, of course, need watching, and if it be found necessary, need resisting. We should not be indifferent or ignorant, for these popes from time to time have published their creeds and have made known their intentions through Bulls and Encyclical Letters. The present Pope has issued about half-a-dozen already to tell the world what it ought to do, as if we did not know as much as an Italian shut up in a palace and knowing very little about the world. If he had a week carrying a hod, or working as a stone-mason, or in some machine shop, he would have more judgment at the end than he has now. They have made known their intention; in fact they are not backward in proclaiming an absolute sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal. In plain language they tell us what they want and what they would do if they had the power. They are working secretly and openly, with this object ever in view, and we have no reason to disbelieve them. If I have a Catholic brother or sister here to night, do you want me to disbelieve the utterances of your Pope? You say, No. Well, he wants to have temporal power greater than our Queen; he says so. He wants me subject to him in spiritual as well as temporal things. I say I will not. I am not discrediting his desires nor his intentions. In the presence

of such utterances, in the light of history, I am not warranted in believing that modesty would restrain them, or that the fear of God would keep them back, from persecuting or throttling our liberties. With all the charity I can muster I cannot persuade myself, as some people do, that our holy religion and altar and home and the state would be safe in their keeping. They have wrecked the whole of these four things in every nation where they have had control. They have made a burlesque and idolatry of religion. They have polluted and defiled the very altars. They have taken away the secrecy and chastity of the home. They have impoverished and enslaved the state, and you say, Put such men in power again because they have changed. I don't believe a bit of it. I will trust them when the millenium comes—not before. They will have to be well converted and filtered through a lot of generations before they will be all right.

To you, my regular hearers of the last nine years, and to myself there is something very interesting in the present Jesuitical agitation going on in the pulpit, on the platform and through the press. Yes, in the mouths of everybody I find on the streets and railway cars and in our very homes. Why this furore? Why this excitement? How comes it that we are just now being agitated all through our country? Might I ask why we cry after the milk has been spilt? Might I ask you why we are shutting the door of the stable after the horse has been stolen? Is that our position? It is with nine-tenths of you in this audience, and an equal number outside. You will never cry until your crying does not amount to anything, nor will you ever work at the proper time. You are afraid. You will not cheer that because there is nobody left to cheer. Now the best answer I can give to this question is, that we were not

as timely as we should have been in this agitation; but perhaps it is better late than never.

Eight years ago I preached from this pulpit about the aims and movements of the Jesuits in Canada. They had just been expelled from France and were coming in increasing numbers into Canada. What I stated at that time I find now to be correct, for from very recent and present events I discover that I rightly interpreted their workings. It was not as popular a subject in those days as it is at present. My deacons came and conversed with me at that time, and asked me if it was policy to deal with such a question. Some of my pew-holders resigned because I would persist in bringing such questions before the public. I hope they are settled somewhere better, and likely a few more of you may go; but I think not. You are thoroughly trained now. Both religious and secular press had little to say on the subject then. They gave me but little encouragement, little praise and considerable criticism. The pulpit even was by no means in harmony with my sayings and doings in this matter. Both press and pulpit said I was a stirrer up of strife. Here and there a ministerial brother would now and again give me and Bond Street Church a good crack on the knuckles from their pulpit, and I suppose felt a good deal better after they had done it. I know in two or three cases we were piously and earnestly criticized for allowing ourselves to smile and cheer in this church. These ministers so criticizing us were rewarded by their own congregations cheering and smiling, and I have not the slightest doubt they enjoyed it, and felt for once that they had said something worth being heard and even cheered. My good Presbyterian friends in Knox Church actually cheered the pious Rev. Dr. Pierson, of Philadelphia, who was preaching to them a short

time since. It is astonishing! They are imitating Bond Street, for here we do nothing but what is right and good.

But times and things have changed, and I am glad of it. The pulpit and press, the Tories, Grits and Reformers are all getting alarmed at the increasing power of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and of the encroachments of Jesuitism. I said a short time ago that we should have begun this agitation some time before, and that we are a little late in the day now. Many forget, if they ever knew, that three Jesuit Bills have actually been passed, and the fun is the hue and cry is over the last one only, the one that we outside of Quebec have the least to do with whilst we allowed the other two to pass. I am not clear in my own mind but that the Parliament of Quebec had a perfect right to dispose of its money as it saw fit, especially to a corporate body in its own Province and a body recognized by its own laws. So far as the Province of Ontario goes I would claim such a right for it, and I should tell Quebec or any other province that sought to interfere with us as to what we should vote our money for, to mind their own business and to stand aside, as it is our own right and we can err or otherwise as we choose. I am not very clear in my own mind whether the Dominion Government, the Governor General, Sir John A. Macdonald, or either or all have a right or the power to interfere with the money grant of Quebec to an incorporated society of that province. Strictly speaking, I believe they have not. John A. Macdonald could not have disallowed that Bill, nor the Governor General even, had they felt ever so much disposed; they have not the power to do so. The wrong and the error is back of that money grant.

Some two years ago the Jesuits were incorporated by an Act of the Parliament of Quebec, and are to-day one of the constituted societies of that province sanctioned by the law of that province. That is the Act that could have and should have been disallowed. That was the time to have raised our voice, and made an effectual protest against the incorporation of that society. Our crying is too late. The Jesuits have been too sharp for us, excepting this pulpit, thank the good Lord. There was only one pulpit in the whole Dominion that joined hands with me, the Rev. John Borland, a Methodist minister who has since gone home to heaven.

Then was our golden opportunity. Then it was in the power of the Ottawa Government; then it was indisputably in the power of the Governor-General to have vetoed such an Act! But the time has gone by, and we whine and cry about a thing we cannot touch at the present time. Then I preached a sermon on the subject on June 5, 1887, and did my very best to call public attention to what should be done. On Sunday, July 8, 1888, I again took up the subject, and preached for the Orangemen, when I called the attention of the public to the fact that the Jesuits being then an incorporated body, their next movement would be to get back some of the estates that were naturally escheated to the British crown at the time of the conquest of Quebec in 1759. They have done exactly as I had said. They now know as well as you and I that we cannot touch them on that money grant. I will now tell you their next movement. So do not cry until it is all over. In a few years they will come to the Dominion Parliament to ask that body to refund these $400,000 with interest to the Province of Quebec,

Then we will have the power because we are a part of the Dominion Parliament, and may properly resist such a demand. You will see this come to pass. I am a good prophet on the Ten-Lost-Tribes and Jesuitism.

I do not think, however, that the Province of Quebec has the power to incorporate the Jesuits. I do not believe, in the sight of British law, that the Jesuits are now at this moment an incorporated body, and if I had dealings with a member of that society and could get him to sue me in a Dominion court they could not be recognized as having any status whatever, nor could they make any claim upon me, because British law and the Statutes of Great Britain forbid the existence of such a society. Those laws and statutes have never been repealed or even amended excepting in one case which I shall subsequently refer to. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth in 1685, a law was passed making it treason for even a Catholic priest to be found in England, and a felony to harbour one; and the Jesuits were expelled on the penalty of death. That law has never been repealed, and is in force in Britain. In the conquest of Canada by Great Britain in 1759, nothing is said in the Articles of Capitulation about the Jesuits. It was simply agreed and stated that the Roman Catholics "shall be allowed to practise their own religion agreeably with the laws of Great Britain;" not according to the laws of France nor of Rome. These were the very favours they asked, but the British General in reply to their petition said, "You are by conquest British subjects, and you must be obedient to British law." (Applause) It came to pass then that as British law could not recognize the Jesuits their property was escheated, and they could have no existence in Canada. The Jesuit, it is plain, could have

no status after the Conquest. Hence the order to disband and their property escheated to the Crown. In the Treaty of Paris nothing was said or alluded to favouring the Jesuits. In the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of Great Britain and Ireland, passed in 1829 (this is where the amendment I referred to previously comes in), an amendment was inserted providing against the recognition and freedom of the Jesuits. It gave freedom to the body of Catholics, but lest that should be interpreted to mean freedom to the Jesuits, they put in a special clause forbidding the Jesuits to enter the land or to form any organization in Great Britain.

Now the common laws and general laws of Great Britain, when not otherwise provided for, are in force in Canada. The Jesuits have no standing in British law; therefore, they can have no such right of incorporation in the Dominion of Canada, except the same be given to them by the Government of the Dominion, with the consent of Great Britain. Such consent and such law have never yet been granted. Surely a province cannot set aside the general law of the Empire or assume the functions and powers of the general Government. The Jesuits cannot have any status in the Dominion courts or in the eye of the Dominion laws. It would be a strange thing if a province could pass laws to override the Dominion laws and Britain's laws. The British law says it is a penalty unto death for a Jesuit to be in our province. I do not want you to take the law in your own hands. (Applause) I don't want you to try the experiment, because at that point I might be a poor lawyer.

Leaving this point, we want to go back to the Incorporation Bill. Some five or six years ago a

number of those Jesuits expelled from France came to our country and selected a home in the North-West, and took to themselves the title of Holy Fathers, or Oblats Peres. They did not go to Quebec for the incorporation. This was the entering of the wedge. Nine out of every ten of those Oblats Peres are known to be Jesuits. They went to the Dominion Parliament, asked for incorporation and it was granted to them. They are now up in the North-West accumulating property very rapidly, and in about twenty-five or thirty years hence they will be giving our brethren up there very serious trouble. At the same time the Orangemen asked for incorporation, but were refused. Now some of you say "We don't care for the Orangemen." Very well, there is one rule that the Dominion Parliament should know. They should either reject or grant all incorporations. How, under the sun, the most loyal and patriotic people, true to their country and Queen, should have been refused incorporation, and these rascals should receive it, I am at a loss to know; and men, too, who were expelled out of France, a Catholic country. They came here under disguise, and politicians were hoodwinked. I would rather let my right hand wither than vote for the Conservative or Reformer who voted against the Orange Bill at that time. Then was the time for us to have thrown in all our energies against the passing of that Bill, and I believe, had we acted to a man, we could have defeated it.

What we need, my dear friends, in Canada, is that the same spirit which pervades the Gospel should pervade us in our politics. In Colossians iii. 11, we read, "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond

nor free; but Christ is all and in all." So politically we should know neither the Englishman, Scotchman, Irishman, Welshman, Frenchman, German, Italian or any other race, but we should be known as British Canadians (applause), the highest type of manhood, for privileges and opportunities, that walks the present earth. So long as we are known as Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Irishmen, and claim special exemptions, so long shall we be insecure. Are you Canadians? Then let us be one—united. And the same on the line of religion—we must be one. The law should know no distinction. We must not be known to the law of the Dominion as Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, or Roman Catholics; but we should be known as Christians and citizens, enjoying equally the laws of our country. This is the law I am going to teach you in the future. This is the law that is bringing a mighty force to the agitation that is now going on. I trust the good Lord will help us in the agitation, for I believe we can see the finger of God in the movement. I pray for His Divine guidance to us in all things. Amen.

WHAT TO DO WITH THE JESUITS.

Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive a full reward.—2 EPISTLE OF JOHN, verse 8.

THERE is a great difference in the birthright heritage of people born into this world. For myself, I am glad that I was born a British subject, and of Christian parents who recognized no spiritual authority or headship higher than Jesus Christ, and who recognized no temporal authority over that of our beloved Queen Victoria. It is no mean estate that has been handed down to us for safe keeping as well as for improvement. This may easily be understood if we will only estimate its cost. Let us be careful not to dishonour our departed fathers or rob the coming children of generations in the future of the birthright privileges that should go down unto them. Let us be careful, as in the text, that we lose not those things for which our heroic fathers and many of us have fought and are fighting to-day. It cannot fail to strengthen our nerves and increase our courage if we remember what our sires endured in persecution, in suffering, in the sacrifice of life, in money, that we might be the sons and daughters of freemen. The same wily and unscrupulous foes that our fathers had to contend with are also in our midst, unchanged in spirit and unchanged in their aim. They are still as determined as ever to centralize both temporal and spiritual power in the hands of yonder con-

ceited and pompous Italian who dwells in the palace of the Vatican at Rome—no place for Britons to deposit their highest honour or their highest authority. Notice this last week in proof of what I say. Mr. Trudel, a member of the Provincial Parliament of Quebec, gave notice of a motion to the following effect—I will give you a portion of it : " That this House desires to express its opinion that it would be a gracious act on the part of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, if she were to evince her good will by exerting her influence to obtain for our Sovereign Pontiff the restoration of the ancient patrimony of St. Peter, bequeathed over a thousand years ago to the predecessors of Leo XIII., and whilst effecting this restoration to restore the temporal power of the great Pope." Now imagine that such a resolution could be proposed in a Parliament in the Dominion of Canada. This Romanist and his colleagues are not afraid to voice their sentiments ; they are not as timid as you and others. They are not afraid to prefer their Church to their party and the Pope to the Queen. They are not mealy-mouthed. Why should we be ? Who, I ask, among our Protestant politicians—Reformers, Conservatives or Independents—dare come out so boldly in favour of God, the Queen and the country ? There is no politician in the land dare. We are crippled ; they have so ensnared us that we dare not say our own mind on the political line.

The honourable member for East Simcoe has given notice of a motion in the Dominion Parliament in favour of Home Rule in Ireland. This gentleman could not have read the following : Of the 900 non-Episcopal ministers in Ireland, including Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and Congregationalists, 864 signed the anti-Home Rule address to Lords Salisbury and Hartington

on November 16, 1888. Only 126 refused to sign, of whom only eight were against Home Rule. Add to these non-Episcopal ministers the Episcopalians, who are ever loyal and sound the world around, and you have an expression — the best that can be got from Ireland — superior to Dillon's, Davitt's or William O'Brien's. (Applause) Now, it seems to me that a man proposing in one of our Parliaments such a question ought to have had more sense. He is a large man, and capable of having a good deal. Surely Mr. Cook must forget also that this thing has been done twice before, and the British Parliament both times gave us a just snubbing, and told us to attend to our own affairs. (Applause) It would please me better, and, I am under the impression, a vast majority of this country, if these paid agents of ours at Ottawa would mind their own business, and, instead of meddling with Home Rule in Ireland, give a little of their time and some attention to Rome Rule in Canada (applause); for, be assured, this is the greatest question of this day. It is the most dangerous and the most important question of the present hour, and it is going to agitate this Dominion from end to end. Let the Irish Home Rule Question take care of itself, but let our members of Parliament exert themselves, and help to preserve the liberties that have been so hardly wrought and handed down to us. It is their duty.

The Italian Government has just passed a law forbidding the Roman Catholic priests to preach or speak in public in favour of the temporal power of the Pope. Here we are allowing it in Cathedrals, in Parliament and everywhere, when Catholic countries will have none of it. Why should we be so much more generous than they? Why should a Protestant community be asked

to do what Catholic communities won't do—on what rule? Contrary to the laws and usages of Great Britain and Canada, Quebec has already recognized the temporal power of the Pope; for in the late Jesuit Estates Bill a clause was inserted that referred the Bill to the Pope for his sanction as to whether, when and how the Bill should become operative, and how the $400,000 should be divided. What business has he to settle upon Acts passed in our Parliament, and be the last referee? Her Majesty has the power, and not the Pope. (Applause)

Now, in regard to certain statements that I made last Sunday evening, having rather a legal aspect, I rejoice very much for the confirmation from several good lawyers that I had taken a good point, and find also that I have been sustained by certain journals that are worthy of authority. Now, to confirm my statement of last Sunday evening, that Quebec cannot incorporate the Jesuits, and that they have no right to appeal to the Pope—that both are unconstitutional—I will quote from the *Canada Law Journal* the following: "The Imperial Parliament has from earliest days made it a criminal offence for subjects of the crown to procure judgment or determining from the See of Rome, or from any other foreign power or potentate out of the realm. In the twenty-fifth, twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth years of the reign of Edward III., and in the thirteenth and sixteenth years of the reign of Richard II., this prohibitive legislation against the Pope's jurisdiction in England commenced. The Statute 24 of Henry VIII., chapter 12, prohibits any inhibition, appeal, sentence, judgment, or any other process from the See of Rome. A statute of the same year forbids even the king, his heirs or successors to be guilty of the same thing. The

statutes of Queen Elizabeth are equally as precise and as emphatic on this point."

In the Jesuit Estates Act we read the following: "The Holy Father reserves to himself the right of settling the question of the Jesuit estates in Canada, and that the agreement with this Government is to be binding only in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope." Now that is unconstitutional; that is treason of the very worst kind by the laws of the land. (Applause) If I were as treasonable, I would be put in jail. Is it not time to ask the reason why this people can go unquestioned and unpunished, and have privileges that nobody else can? They can hold lotteries all through the Dominion—in Ontario here—and no officer of the law has the courage to take them up (applause); but let Bond Street, or the Masons, or the Orangemen attempt to hold one and see how quickly the law will interfere. How comes it then that this people have these superior privileges accorded them? They are no better than we are at any given point; in fact, they are much inferior to us. I am sick of the imbecility of the law, of the Government, of the authorities in not dealing in an impartial manner with the whole country, squarely, fairly and honestly. Every man will understand me that, in making this statement, I do not mean to take away all lawful liberties or to in any way enslave him.

It must have been a rare sight, I imagine, the opening of the last Provincial Parliament at Quebec. The new Lieutenant-Governor going to Parliament in state for the first time received notice that his Eminence Cardinal Taschereau could not take part in the ceremony unless he should have a throne erected on the same platform, on the left side of the Speaker, that he have his right hand to him; and that in going into the

House this Roman prince must go up the stairs first, for as a prince of Rome he is superior to the Lieutenant-Governor of her Majesty in Quebec. They allowed it, and he sat there with his cocked hat on.

The question is: What shall we do? I answer, Do our duty through our representatives, if we can. If they will not undertake this work, why Protestants and the majority of the people must seek others who will. (Applause) I have never advocated a third party heretofore, nor anything that would tend to break up the present parties. This, I think, you will bear me out in. I am now, however, coming to the conclusion, and I find the sentiment of the country is very rapidly drifting in this way, that unless there is more backbone both in the Local and Dominion Parliaments they are going to be swept clean out of existence as sure as there is a God above us. I shall be very slow to lift my voice against either. Of course we can do nothing with the parties as they are at present. This is very self-evident. I would not lift my finger to put out the Hon. Mr. Mowat's Government for that of Mr. Meredith, for should Mr. Meredith's Government be placed in power by this Roman Catholic vote he would be far more subject to its authority than is the present ministry. If we were to put out Sir John A. Macdonald and his cabinet, and replace it by putting in a Liberal ministry, they would have to pay more to get into power than does Sir John, for he does not always pay what he promises. So we have no relief in the changing of the present parties; that is a settled fact. I mean to say this: The Reform party as led by Mr. Laurier or Mr. Blake could do nothing more with this power than Sir John and his friends; nor could Mr. Meredith and his party in Ontario grapple any more successfully with it than

the Hon. Oliver Mowat. I begin to see that there is coming up a party between these two, unless out of them some man shall speak out boldly and fearlessly. I believe in my heart to-night that, had the Hon. Mr. Mowat, when pressed by the Roman Catholics for special legislation, said out boldly like a man, "No, gentlemen, I will go to the country first," and had gone to the country on these grounds he would have been sent back by as large, if not a larger, majority than he has at present. (Applause)

In the next place, Protestants will naturally have to band together. The liberties that are being imperilled are growing so much more important than party. I am a party man myself, but I do feel that the liberties that are being taken from us are getting dearer and of more worth to me than my party. If this thing goes on I shall have to leave go my party and lay hold for the defence of the liberties of my country for my children's sake.

Again, in the present crisis let the Protestants of Quebec take out an injunction restraining the Quebec Government from paying over the $400,000 to the Jesuits. I am going to give you some more legal advice to-night which you will find correct. They can do this, but they are cowards down there; there does not seem to be a man who dare open his mouth. It would then be brought into the Courts. Perhaps they might lose the case if it were brought into the Provincial Courts. Then bring it into the Dominion Courts where the Jesuit has no title, is unknown, but is under the penalty of death. If it were sent to the Privy Council they could do nothing but say there is no party for the reception of the money, because there is no such person known to the law of Great Britain as a Jesuit.

(Applause) How in the world could you pay $400,000 to nobody?

A similar case to this was tried in France a short time ago. In a will, amongst other things it was directed that a certain sum of money be set apart for the saying of masses, and of course the church claimed the amount. The court, however, decided it was not definite enough to know who the parties were and what was their condition in purgatory to make the will valid. It would be just the same on this question. I do hope some of our Lower Province Protestants will band together. The question is not a political one. Neither Sir John A. Macdonald nor the Governor-General, nor any other man, could disallow it. It is a legal question, and the Jesuits well knew it. The point to be decided is, can they as a Province create such an Order? If the Court decides they can, then it is within the power of our Government to disallow it; and if the case is tested, and the decision of the Court is that the Province of Quebec has power to incorporate the Jesuits, then we will see that our Government disallow it, or know the reason why. Our Superior Courts and Privy Council have interpreted and decided the validity and non-validity of several of our Provincial laws, and so they shall in this case.

The duty of the members of the present Government is to call the Dominion Government's attention to the irregular and unconstitutional action of the Provincial Parliament of Quebec. If Mr. Cook would bring in a resolution like that there would be some sense in it, because the Government then would have to appeal to the Court for a decision, and we would know exactly where we stood. Our own Provincial Government, so interested a short time ago in Home Rule for Ireland

as to send resolutions to Parnell and others, might well now employ its time in asking about such unconstitutional conduct on the part of the sister Province. It would be more sensible than to interfere with the British Parliament in regulating Ireland. Quebec is nearer, and a part of the federation, and they should ask, What means this conduct in Quebec? Perhaps they will now.

The Province of Ontario, my friends, is ours, and we must keep it for ourselves. Let every Protestant gradually be taken out of Quebec, and the sooner the people there are left alone, with the Roman Catholic religion the dominant one, the sooner they will fall behind in the progress of the age. Ontario belongs to the Ontarians, and the laws ruling them must be obeyed, and in Grenville and Prescott and the Eastern Townships there must not be allowed to exist any public school wherein French only is taught. Let them do as they like in Quebec, but this is Ontario. The Hon. Mr. Ross is going to furnish returns regarding the public schools in Eastern Ontario, and if it be found that there are schools so established wherein the French is taught solely, we are going to see that such be done away with. We are not going to allow our French neighbours to come in with their religion that way and subvert our schools by teaching only French in a British Province, where the English language is the legal one, and these are the legal schools. If our French brethren wish to share their lot with us they must stand upon the same platform. We are not going to create special schools for their liking. We have made one mistake already in granting Separate Schools, but we are going to be wiser for the future.

Perhaps it may be necessary to form a new party to balance these powers. I would not have a lengthy plat-

form such as has been published, but this simple one, "No Class legislation; no special recognition of any Church; no race distinctions." With these three points, I believe, we could carry the whole of Ontario.

The Jesuits must be suppressed and expelled from Canada. (Applause) They are too dangerous a foe for a young country like this to have. We are too much in the building up process now, and they can seriously interfere with our welfare. I am surprised that the Rev. Father Flannery, of St. Thomas, should defend the Jesuits as he did in St. Michael's Cathedral, last Sunday evening. If the report of his sermon is correct, this gentleman has not read history very much, or if he has read history very much he has a very poor memory, or if he has a good memory he has not caught the truth, or at least if he did catch it he did not tell it. He had better stay in St. Thomas and write some more poetry. A couple of years ago there came to our city a gentlemen, William O'Brien, and there was a mass meeting held in connection with his visit. This rev. father wrote a very fine piece of poetry, very sarcastic and abusive of myself, about a speech I made there. The fun of the thing is I was not at the meeting and, consequently, never made the speech attributed to me; yet this rev. father has never had the modesty to apologize to me for that insult. I will leave that to himself, and if there be a purgatory it will make it a little hotter for him. In his sermon he is reported as saying: "Why were not these men [referring to the Jesuits] brought before some judge and tried, and told that they were accused of certain crimes? Was there ever any trial given them in Spain or in France? They never had a trial." Now, imagine a man in the face of all history making a statement like this. They were tried hundreds

of times in France, Spain and Portugal, by the regular courts and by special commissions.

On September 27, 1540, Pope Paul III. constituted the Order of the Jesuits. Ignatius Loyola was their first General. He was born in 1491 in Loyola, in the Basque Provinces; he died at Rome July 31, 1556. He was beatified in 1609, and made a Saint by Pope Gregory XV. in 1622, the next day after he left purgatory for anything we know. There are lots of things you can say which nobody can dispute. This society has been in existence, legally and illegally, 348 years. At the Conquest of Canada by Britain in 1759, the Jesuits really ceased to have a legal standing, still they kept together and drew the revenues of their property. The British Government finally had, by a royal Imperial decree in 1774, to suppress them in Canada; yet out of its generosity it did not turn one single Jesuit out on the street, but agreed to pay them an annuity sufficient to keep them so long as they lived, and the last of these poor rich Jesuits died in 1800. Was that not kind of the British Government? More than they were worth by a long way. But the Crown, as I have said, suppressed them.

On July 23, 1773, Pope Clement XIV. annulled this Order, and issued his celebrated Bull, *Dominus ac Redemptor noster.* He would not give his reasons for anulling them, because they were so foul and filthy that he would not tell anybody. Pope Paul VII. restored them or created a new body in 1814, so far as spiritual recognition goes. For 114 years, they have had no legal standing in any part of the world; but in 1887 they received this legal standing and status, as supposed, in the Province of Quebec, Canada; the only place where they can sue and be sued. And now a little

information for my friend Flannery. The Jesuits have been expelled from the different states and countries as follows:—Saragossa, 1555; La Palatine, 1558; Vienna, 1566; Avignon, 1570; Antwerp, 1578; Portugal, 1578; Segovia, 1578; England, 1579; England, 1581; England, 1586; Japan, 1587; Hungary, 1588; Transylvania, 1588; Bordeaux, 1589; France, 1594; Holland, 1596; Toulon, 1597; Berne, 1597; England, 1602; England, 1604; Denmark, 1606; Thorn, 1606; Venice, 1606; Venice, 1612; Japan, 1613; Bohemia, 1618; Moravia, 1619; Naples, 1622; Netherlands, 1622; China, 1623; India, 1623; Malta, 1634; Russia, 1723; Savoy, 1729; Paraguay, 1733; Portugal. 1759; France, 1754; Spain, 1767; Two Sicilies, 1767; Duchy of Parma, 1768; Malta, 1768; Russia, 1776; France, 1804; Eripon, 1804; France, 1806; Naples, 1810; Moscow, 1816; Soleure, 1816; Belgium, 1818; Brest, 1819; Russia, 1820; Spain, 1820; Rouen, 1825; Great Britain and Ireland, 1829; France, 1831; Saxony, 1831; Portugal, 1834; Spain, 1835; Rheims, 1838; Lucerne, 1842; Lucerne, 1845; France, 1845; Bavaria, 1848; Switzerland, 1848; Naples, 1848; Papal States, 1848; Liuz, 1848; Vienna, 1848; Styria, 1848; Austrian Empire, 1848; Galicia, 1848; Sardinia, 1848; Sicily, 1848; Paraguay, 1848; Italian States, 1859; Sicily, 1860; France and several other countries since.

From all these places have they been expelled, and so many times; yet this man Flannery comes here to enlighten his followers by perverting history, and I dare say the people who were listening to him believed every word he said. This list I have collected and I will vouch for its accuracy. What is more I will challenge either Father Flannery, or any other Flannery, to dispute one single figure or fact. And mark you, they

received the fiercest condemnation from Catholic countries and Popes. Pope Clement XIV. tells us that he had taken all pains to ascertain the true state of things before he declared them annulled. He found in them all manner of crimes. In 1761, the French Government appointed a special Commission to report on this Order. This Commission was made up and composed of thirty-five of the best and most prudent men that France had, only three of them being Protestants, the rest were Catholics. The conclusion of that Commission was that the Society by its teachings and examples authorized theft, lying, perjury, crime and murder, and that they were dangerous and disloyal to the state and corrupting to religion. That is what a Commission of Catholics said; yet they want you and me to admit this people in Canada. These are the people and this the Order that has been incorporated in Quebec.

Are you aware that the greatest and most deadly enemy that Great Britain has had for hundreds of years, has not been any one nation, but it has been the Roman Catholic Church, especially this Jesuitical element of it, that has inflamed nations against her. They have involved us in many wars and insurrections. It was a sad day for England, and especially so for Ireland, when Pope Gregory I. sent St. Augustine as Roman Catholic missionary to England, for they had none before that, and this same Pope consecrated him Archbishop of Canterbury and Metropolitan of England. In this act began the war that has raged from that day to this, especially in poor Ireland. Both countries had a church, a religion and a priesthood, and were at rest and peace until these people came into their midst to disturb them. They will do it wherever they go, unless they are converted. They are not loyal; and, if they are in har-

mony with Pope Pius IX. and with the present Pope—*i.e.*, if they are good Catholics—they cannot, as Mr. Gladstone says in his Vatican Work, be good British subjects. If they obey the encyclical of Pius IX., as well as that of the present Pope, they will destroy liberty of conscience, free schools, free speech and an open Bible. Are we prepared for this destruction? I have a few Catholic friends here to-night. Are you good Catholics? Then, if you are, you will have to seek to destroy all these things I have enumerated. If you cannot, you had better join Bond Street Church.

My dear friends, I have given you another discourse on this subject. It will be widely spread. I have tried to be as careful in my statements as possible, and I shall remain open to correction or criticism by any man in the Dominion. If anybody can convince me that I have made any wilful error, I will honourably recant. May the good Lord guide us to the truth! Amen.

WHAT THE JESUITS WILL DO.

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.—MATTHEW vii. 12.

THESE are wholesome words, expressive of a comprehensive principle that is very essential in our daily practice so long as we shall live together as families and as states and nations. The possibilities of the general application of the primary principle contained in these words stand very suitably over against the universal brotherhood of men. Family peace, state security and national prosperity, rest assured, can only be secured by acting on the Golden Rule. A noble few have struggled long and heroically in every age and in every country to enforce this rule. It has been tedious work to define and secure for the individual his birthright liberty, and it has taken a long time to define what the family was and what were its claims and its sacred privileges. Unfortunately man has loved to rule and tyrannize over man, both in the Church and in the State. The masses have been and numerously are now under the iron rule of the autocrat or some oligarchy, or else subject to the kings, to the nobles, and to a rich favoured few; but as sure as the mountains are levelling down under the influences of rain and moisture, frost and heat, so surely are these unreasonable and unchristian distinctions gradually disappearing before the march of Christianity and civilization, as they spring from the Gospel. The Gospel of Jesus teaches us, and it means

that we are not to be slaves, nor to hold others in slavery, either in things temporal or in things spiritual; and no man has authority, excepting by the commission of his equal brethren, to lord it over them. We are brethren, and Christ only is our spiritual head. The Magna Charta of British liberty has not been rescinded, but it has been enlarged and will continue to grow until the full dawn of the millenial day. We are not going to turn our backs on the great privileges forged by the heroic fathers of that day for the liberties of the common people. As free men and Christians we cannot reasonably be expected to assent to the assumptions and claims of the Pope; it is an outrageous demand to make upon a free man in the sight of his God even to consent to such a thing. By the authority of Heaven the Pope is neither a temporal nor a spiritual sovereign. I will tell you what he is: he is simply the centre and head of a vast organization that has through the centuries grown to its present power and position; an organization which history teaches us to interpret means power and wealth for a few and poverty and obedience for the many. In every case where it has absolute control, those are the real conditions of the people. The claims of the Pope, and the duties implied in the oath of a Cardinal or a Bishop or a Jesuit to his chief are incompatible with the individual liberty and with natural freedom; and I repeat to-night what the Hon. Mr. Gladstone said in his book on Vaticanism, "that no man can be a sincere and good Catholic and a loyal British subject." He has got to slight one or the other. I know some will say they can; but I would simply point to what the church demands at their hands and asks faith in. If such persons are honest and true to their vows and oaths, they will labour to exterminate all heretics,

and subject all earthly thrones and powers to the See of Rome. Where they have not the power they work and wait, and when and where they have the power they vigorously carry out their own purposes and intentions. We tolerate them—nay, more, we have made them equal to ourselves before the law, both temporally and spiritually. This they have not done, and will not do voluntarily in any case where they have the privilege. Now, to sustain what I say, Roman Catholic Bishop O'Connor says: "Religious liberty is simply endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world." I believe, you, sir, I don't doubt you for a moment, because you have all history at your back. It has been so, and it will be so to-morrow as you say. The *Catholic Review* says: "Protestantism of every form has not and never can have any rights where Catholicity is triumphant." There are lots of Catholics who do not believe that. You do not believe your Bishops. I believe them. I believe they tell the honest truth before their God. They would just do what they say if they had the power, and they are labouring in that direction as earnestly as do a hive of bees in a field of flowers to gather honey. The claims of the Pope are neatly summarized by Cardinal Manning, for he makes the Pope to say the following: "I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no Prince; and I claim more than this; I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men—of the peasant that tills the fields and of the prince that sits upon the throne, and of the household that lives in privacy, and the legislator that makes laws for the king; I am the sole, last and supreme judge of what is right and wrong." You are the supreme humbug (applause) and I might say a great deal worse. I simply say that

such language is blasphemous in the presence of God and makes us ashamed for the vanity of man.

In the oath taken by the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church they have to swear the following: "Heretics, schismatics and rebels to our said Lord or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose." Now, friends, I ask you in all sincerity, Are we to believe the Pope and these men on their solemn oath? I believe them. And that means for me that I must make a bold defence if I wish to preserve my liberties. If we do believe, we know that in the name of religion they are our sworn enemies, individually, in the family, in the state and in the nation; and I will defy Father Hands or any other Catholic priest or any Catholic brother in Toronto to reconcile freedom with a statement like that as given by their own authorities. There is no possibility of a reconciliation. And you and I as Christians and Protestants are positively pledged to be their friends. In the name of our religion we can not either persecute or force their consciences to our ideas. We stand before them with a liberal hand and ask for them what we ask for ourselves and in no case can we persecute them. If we took an oath when we were converted and gave ourselves to God it is that we accept the golden rule and do unto all men as we would that they should do unto us. That rule must govern. We cannot in the name of our religion and in the name of our country, and in the name of our children, and in the name of liberty, and in the name of God persecute—we can resist; we must restrain them from carrying out their unauthorized and unholy intentions. That is our duty and in doing this they at once raise the cry of persecution and many good natured Protestants are misled and say, "Oh, let them alone,"

when it simply means, as they gain additional power, greater dangers to all the liberties of the human family.

The Jesuits' oath is still more binding and obligatory on its members, and more blasphemous and dangerous to Protestants. This oath has been frequently printed in our public journals of late, hence I will not repeat it. Some of our Catholic friends deny that it is the real oath. They do not know any more about it than I do, unless they are Jesuits. What I simply want to say is, I have read that oath, and the published one is as nearly like the original as one can possibly get. There may be a slight variation in the wording of it, but the main idea is there. As we have a few Jesuits in Toronto, they will, no doubt, correct this statement, if not true. It is not sufficient, nor is it evidence, for them to say that it is not so; they must show wherein it is wrong and give us the correct one. If they do so under conditions that are binding, why, of course, we will acknowledge our error. They do believe that the end justifies the means. They can hold the truth in mental reservation, hence it is hard to argue with them or to know when to believe them. I called your attention some time ago to a case that transpired in the Province of Quebec two years ago in connection with a lawsuit in which the Beaupré Asylum played a part. One of the lawyers engaged upon the case, a Roman Catholic too, asked a prominent gentleman of Quebec, who was in the witness stand, whether, if he, knowing a thing to be true, could swear that it was not, if the Church required it, and he replied that he could, and what is more, that he would. Now, what could I do in court with such a man as that? He could swear the truth to be a lie, if it were for the interest of his Church. Under such circumstances, if the real oath

were produced, it would be very difficult for us to tell whether it was the true one or not; so I will take it for granted that the one that has been published is the true one until a better one is substituted.

The Rev. Father Whelan lectured last Sunday evening Feb. 24th, in the city of Ottawa, in defence of the Jesuits. I take the following from the *Ottawa Citizen* of Feb. 25th: "He said that it had been urged that obedience even unto sin was a tenet of the Jesuits; but no one who knows Latin could hold any such belief. They promise in all cases obedience where there is no sin." That is craftily put, and no one will gain the reward he has offered. The chief point in the Jesuit oath is obedience. Whatever they do, be it in the nature of good or bad, if they obey their superior, they believe they are doing right. They do not swear in the whole oath to do the right and be the judges of the right individually themselves. Obedience is their virtue and disobedience is a sin. How can they sin then when they obey their superiors in everything? Father Whelan knows perfectly well that no individual Jesuit has liberty to determine what is right or what is wrong. A Jesuit swears to implicitly obey his superiors in all he is commanded to do; hence, in all cases, they promise obedience where there is no sin for the simple reason there cannot be sin in their meaning while they are obeying their commands. Father Whelan having, as he thinks, hid $500 in the Jesuit web of sophistry goes on to say the following: "I will give $500 to any one who can produce a *bona fide* passage from Jesuit precepts to show that the end justifies the means. The offer is good until the 12th of July next." That is so, I suppose, that the Orangemen may have a chance. Now, I will become liberal also. I will give $501 to Father

Whelan or any other person who will produce the *bona fide* precepts and oath of the Jesuits so as to satisfy the Jesuits. This will be easy, as he can have access to the Jesuit authorities. He must know more than I do. Let him produce the oath and the precepts of secret instructions to the Jesuits before a jury of six Catholics and six Protestants in the city of Toronto. My offer shall stand good until July 13th next. If Father Whelan should lose his case and be out of pocket by coming to Toronto, I will put him in the way of earning $502 by proving before the same jury that my late friend, Archbishop Lynch, is in purgatory or out of it. I do not care which side he takes; he can have his choice. I want to show you this—that a man can ask a question which no man can prove or disprove. His offer of $500 is on a line that he knows no man can prove or disprove; so is my offer. I daresay his audience thought he was very manly when he offered what he knew, Jesuitically, nobody could get. This last offer of mine shall stand until the 12th July, 1890, to give him a good chance.

The Jesuits will continue their crafty policy of crushing out Protestantism when, how, and wherever they can. They will divide the State, weaken the throne, as they have the power and opportunity; they will incite to rebellion, insurrection and war to carry their point, as they have done in the past. They believe in the temporal and spiritual sovereignty of the Pope, and they will work night and day to bring the same to pass. They want everbody under the Pope, and the Pope under them. History will have to be rewritten, even by Roman Catholic historians, before any one of common sense can honestly believe to the contrary. Anyway the Roman Catholic Church has too much political

influence to make for the prosperity, the peace, and the unity of the Province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada. I have no objections to its religion ; nor would I trouble myself five minutes about it ; but I do object that men shall take an oath to exterminate me, and then, if I happen to say a Jesuit might be shot, if you could find one, meaning that under the British law there is no such a person and, therefore, you could not find one to shoot at ; yet even, if I said it literally, I did not take an oath ; still these men have taken the oath, and if they had the power, they would persecute and extinguish me. There is nothing wrong in their taking the oath, oh, no ; but what I said is called a rebellious utterance.

We should remember that foreign allegiance spiritually, always and everywhere is political insecurity and danger at home. We have had a fine illustration in the short history of Canada, on this point. The Episcopal Methodists of Canada were one and the same body with those in the United States, but in the agitations that culminated in the rebellion of 1837 they were obliged to separate from their friends in the United States, as public opinion would not favour a religious body in Canada that had its headquarters in the United States. Why, then, should it be thought strange that we do not look favourably upon the Jesuits whose headquarters are in Italy and who are a hundred times more dangerous than all the Methodists put together, and ten times more disloyal than a Methodist ever knew how to be? If Canadians demanded that the Methodists should separate from their brethren in the United States lest it might influence them, so on that same ground I demand that Roman Catholics and all be separated from Italy, a country far away over the ocean. They have no more

right to that recognition than my Methodist brethren had. We dismantled the Church of England and the old kirk, and placed them on an equal level with all the other churches. Their clergy reserves we brought into the common market and levelled them up with ours. Why should we be afraid of the Jesuits and the Roman Catholics ; why not equalize and level them up ? They are the least worthy in this respect than any of them, that is a public recognition. It were far better to have recognized the Church of England as a state church, and to have allowed her her privileges and reserves than to allow these people to gain their property and special privileges as they are doing in our Dominion. What have the Jesuits done the last seven years since they have been driven out of France and made our country a special rendezvous ?

First. Under the disguised name of Oblat Fathers they are incorporated in the North West Territories. Large tracts of land have been conveyed unto them, I am credibly informed by a man who knows, and accumulations of other property have been made easy at their hands, and they are gathering a large amount of farming lands and the best sites of that North Western country into their possession, In the second place, they then began to interfere with legislation wherever that legislation might seem to be opposed to them ; hence came their resistance to the Orange Bill, which, I am sorry to say, was only too successful. In the third place, they then got an Act of Incorporation in their own real name in the Province of Quebec. In the fourth place, they then claimed the ancient estates of the Jesuitical Order that existed more than one hundred years ago, and actually to keep them quiet they have received $400,000. What would be thought in Ontario if, when after the

last of these English Church ministers and old kirk ministers who were commuted by the Government, shall have passed from off this scene of existence, a new order should arise some years hence, and demand these clergy reserves back, and will not be satisfied unless they get the lands or their equivalent in money —what would we say to that? This is the proper way to present this question so that the public can see the heinous nature of it. In the fifth place, then, they voluntarily put the Pope above our Queen in their Legislature, as they did a couple of weeks ago. In the sixth place, then, they make the people of Quebec acknowledge this in open Parliament. In the seventh place, they then began to force to the front, and to legalize as far as prudent, the temporal power of the Pope. True, Dr. Trudel's motion to that effect in the Quebec Legislature has not been accepted; but it, or one like it, will be passed through that Legislature before long. You see how they are at work. They held a public meeting in our Capital, Ottawa, last week, and our Senators and Members of Parliament were there to advocate the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. They are not slow workers, you must remember. In the eighth place, they began to attack Ontario through our public schools, in the teaching of a foreign language and the Roman Catholic Catechism in the schools in the Eastern Townships and in Essex to the West; and so they have come within our borders. In the ninth place they began to divide our political parties, and so gain power and special legislation, and they have that power at this present day. The great problem for Protestants and liberal Catholics to-day is, What balance of power is to be raised up to offset this Catholic power? They can put in a Liberal

Government or a Conservative one in either Dominion or Ontario Legislature whenever they choose. Will we allow them to have this power much longer, or shall we by some method agree to sink our party differences for the time and give them what is their due, and ourselves our just rights. I believe it will be done. In the tenth place, they are preparing for education on a large scale in Quebec by having a university which will have the blessings and special degrees granted from the Pope of Rome. They will, I have not the slightest doubt, when that college is established, receive support for it from the Province of Quebec, as Maynooth College, in Ireland, received nearly $2,000,000 from the British Government, for they never could keep a school going of their own money. The most astonishing thing to my mind is this, that nine out of every ten of the priests who graduate from Maynooth, as soon as they leave the college, curse our Queen until they are black in their faces. Whenever I see these men at a meeting where "God save the Queen" is being sung, and see that they refuse to lift their hats during the singing, I am vexed, especially when I remember, as the fact is, that if it had not been for the Queen's money they would not have hats to wear nor boots upon their feet, but would have been, many of them, wearing brogans and trampling through the bogs of Ireland this day. They are actually educated by British money, and this is the return they give. They will make Quebec support their university. In the eleventh place, they will raise the cry of religious toleration, and so divide Protestants throughout the Dominion. That is what they are doing now, and I have no doubt Father Hand will harp on this string a little to-night in his discourse. In the twelfth place, they will not cease to work until they are put down.

I believe we must cultivate a Canadian sentiment. Our schools must become more Canadian. I have a little poem here from the Third Reader that was once used in our public schools many years ago. It ought to be read in our public schools again.

Hurrah! hurrah for Canada,
Her woods and valleys green,
Hurrah for dear old England,
Hurrah for England's Queen;
Good ships be on her waters,
Firm friends upon her shore,
Peace, peace within her borders,
And plenty in her store.

Right loyally we are singing,
To all nations make it known
That we love the land we live in,
And our Queen upon her throne.
Long may the sons of Canada
Continue as they have been,
True to their native country
And faithful to their Queen.

Let us, my friends, whilst we agitate this question, do so earnestly and kindly, praying always that Divine Providence will guide us, and that our work may reach a successful issue. Amen.

GREAT BRITAIN AND PROTESTANTISM AND OUR DUTY.

For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only He who now letteth will let until he be taken out of the way.—2 THESSALONIANS ii. 7.

LOOKED at from a human standpoint, with our limited knowledge of an over-ruling Providence, we are sometimes led to wonder why God lets some people live and some institutions exist. The mystery of iniquity worketh confusion and destruction. This is especially true of the Jesuit Society. When and wherever they have had a civil status in any state or country on an average of twenty-five years, they have caused rebellion and war without a single exception. What will they do in Canada? What has the future in reserve? Will they and we be an exception to the past? I hope so. I will do my best in that direction. Their incorporation in the Province of Quebec forces a choice of two things upon us as Canadians, either to suppress them by constitutional means now, or by the sword and force later on. We can do either; for the first is our privilege, and power simply waits on our willingness to suppress them if they rise. I have no sympathy with those among us who cry peace at the cost of a future war. I would rather fight myself than leave the legacy for my children. (Applause) Let us remember that this Jesuit question can be easier handled now, both for the good of Protestants and Roman Catholics, than it can in future years.

Again, I have no sympathy with those among us who fear and predict that the agitation of this question will lead to the breaking up of our Confederation. It will do nothing of the kind. Confederation is here to stay, with Imperial Federation right behind it. Protestantism is here to stay; Britain is here to stay; the Queen is on her throne to stay; free schools are here to stay; free speech is here to stay, and liberty of conscience is an heritage that will never again be taken from us. Neither from threats nor through evils of tolerated aggression, which in our country the last few years have been great, must we infer that Protestantism will become the servant of Roman Catholicism, or Canadians be ruled by Quebec, or Britain become subject to the See of Rome. Not one of these things can be. The Jesuits and Roman Catholics and the French are old foes that Britain and Protestantism have met before in contests and wars many times, and in every case she has finally come off victorious, and will do so any other time, and if forced to it will fight to victory again. The Wolfes, the Wolseleys and the Middletons are not all dead, nor are their trusty followers, and it may be that some brave Montcalm shall lead our opponents, and, like him, say when dying: "I have got my death by fighting against the bravest soldiers in the world, at the head of the greatest cowards that ever carried muskets."

The Roman Catholic laity may thank God for the existence of Great Britain and Protestantism. Had it not been for these two forces Rome would have kept them in ignorance, in poverty and in slavery as she did in the middle ages, and as she does now wherever she has full control. There is no exception to this thing. Cardinal Manning, that earnest Roman Catholic and

very good Englishman in many respects, perceives what a strong fort Britain is against the aggressive policy of Rome: so in one of his speeches delivered a few years ago in the city of London, England, he said the following: "If ever there was a land in which work was to be done and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much if I say we have to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and rule an imperial race. We have to bend or break that will which nations and kingdoms have found inflexible. Were heresy conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world."

I believe you, sir. You are a far-seeing man. Britain stands in defence of liberty which both my Roman Catholic friends and we are enjoying to-day, which neither of us would have had had it not been for her. As surely as God fixed the bounds of old ocean, saying, "Here shalt thy proud waves go, and no further!" so has Great Britain set and bound the proud ambition of Rome for hundreds of years.

The claims and aims of Jesuitism are most certainly incompatible with our ideas of freedom. They are against our constitution and against the very things we hold the most sacred. We claim liberty of conscience, freedom of speech, a free press, free schools, and an open Bible. Pope Pius IX., in his encyclical letter of December 8, 1864, denounced in severe terms these things, and the present Pope has united with him in several of his encyclical letters. Now is it to be supposed that at the bidding of the Pope, an Italian, we will yield up these rights that we enjoy so much—never. In one of these letters the Pope makes the following statements—I want you to notice them for they are remarkable: First—"The Romish Church has a right to exercise its authority without any limit set to it by

the civil power." Second—"The Pope and the priests ought to have dominion over the temporal forces."—Third—"The Romish Church and her ecclesiastics have a right to immunity from civil laws." Fourth—"In case of conflict between the ecclesiastical and civil powers, the ecclesiastical powers ought to prevail." Besides, the Jesuits tell us plainly what they want. They want our Queen to be subject to the Pope, and Protestantism totally annihilated and Roman Catholicism to take its place. I, for one, am not favourable to any such change. The Pope's demand and Jesuits' claims we cannot concede without losing our liberty and the whole of our Constitution; and I am surprised that any man or woman who has breathed the free air of Britain should ever ask for such things, even though he or she be a Jesuit or a Roman Catholic. It seems so inconsistent. Her Majesty is a Protestant ruler, and her successors must be so by law. Her throne is a Protestant throne, independent and absolute by law. Now to a people with such claims and aims as the Jesuits, should we grant special favours, and put into their hands special powers by legislation, which powers they shall use to our destruction? I say, No, a thousand times? (Applause) All you have got to do is to believe what they say. They just say what I have stated: they would turn us up side down and put us under side. Still they wonder that we are not patient and quiet, and why we do not take this thing kindly, and they charge us with insolence and bigotry! The Lord bless us, a man has got to live some way. We may tolerate them in a limited way, but we should not be guilty of hastening our own destruction by giving them all they want, and even liberties and favours we deny to Protestant organizations. I have no objection to these

brethren kissing the Pope's toe as a matter of etiquette and as a matter of reverence, if they will allow me to do the same thing for fun if I choose to do so; but not compel me.

Now a word or two with reference to priests Whelan and Hand. Priest Whelan has not yet produced the true Jesuit oath, so I have yet my $501. He has not yet proved whether my late friend Archbishop Lynch is in purgatory or out of it. Indeed, I see by an Ottawa evening journal, March 4th, that priest Whelan now says that there is no such a thing as a Jesuit oath. So that settles it, if you can believe him. He still clings to the statement he made that no Roman Catholic writer or Jesuit author says that the end justifies the means. I will give you one or two quotations:

Rev. Herman Busembaum, born in Westphalia in 1600, died January 31st, 1668, in Münster, in his lifetime was Rector of a Jesuit College in Münster. He published a work called "Medulla Theologiæ Moralis," from which I will make the following quotation: "*Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita*," which, when literally translated is: "When the end is lawful, the means are likewise lawful." And still worse than that he says: "*Cui licitus est finis, etiam licent media*," which means: "To whom the end is lawful the means also have a price put upon them (or the means are also for sale)." The doctrine of indulgence is more than hinted at in a passage like that. The Rev. Paul Laymann, the German Jesuit, and author of several works, was born in 1576 at Innsbrück, and died November 13th, 1635, at Constance. In his book "Moralis Theologiæ," he says: "*Cui concessus est finis, concessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinate*," meaning "To whom the end is conceded, the means are likewise granted, in order to

the end." Quotations of this kind, from Jesuit authors, I could give you by the hundred had I the time. I see by the paper that when priest Whelan's attention was called to these two authorities he said he did not know them. That may be so; but if he be as ignorant as he says, I think his ignorance is unpardonable. To put himself and his $500 forward as he has done, and then to say that he does not know the most prominent authorities in his Church—why he ought to be put out of his pulpit. If he knows them and is acting Jesuitically by telling a lie with a mental reservation, then, I say, he is to be condemned as a man with whom no controversy should be held whilst he still persists in denying historic facts and truths. To a correspondent signed "Ontario" in the daily *Mail* of March 5th, he honourably owes the $500, as well as to myself, unless he can disprove what has been published. He never intended to give the $500. I will give him, as I said, $501, and $502, when he produces the real Jesuit oath, or proves where my friend, Archbishop Lynch, is.

Now, as to my brother, priest Hand. From a report of his sermon last Sunday evening, in St. Michael's Cathedral, in defence of the Jesuits, referring to myself, he is reported as having said the following: "It has been said that the Jesuits were incorporated in the North-West under the name of Oblats. This is denied by the Provincial Secretary of Manitoba, and Archbishop Taché characterizes it as a slanderous falsehood. The Superiors of the Jesuits and Oblats repudiate it as a malicious calumny. One of the Ministers at Ottawa asserts that such a thing never existed save in the debased imagination of a bewildered maniac." I have here a copy of the Bill incorporating the Oblat Fathers. I have two of them. One I will

give to priest Hand, or he can go to the Statutes of 1883 and he will find it there. These people were incorporated on the very day the Orange Bill was rejected. This Provincial Secretary of Manitoba must be a new man. When his Parliament meets, I hope he will ask for the complete returns of the various incorporated Societies in the North-West, that my friend, priest Hand, may be a little better informed. I have a farm of about 200 acres, which I bought and paid for with my own money. I pay taxes on it. I accept no allowance or rebate, but pay my taxes in full, as every honest man ought to do. I would like my friend, Archbishop Taché to give me, as a brother farmer, some little information as to how he gets along with his big farm, 5,120 acres of choice land that the Government gave him for the part he took in settling the first Riel rebellion, a rebellion that, if he did not take part in creating, I am under the conviction he could have stopped had he been so disposed. No doubt his farm is better than mine, for the simple reason that, besides its being entirely free, he has no taxes of any kind to pay, and he got with it several thousands in cash as a bonus also. The next time he sends down a despatch to Toronto to priest Hand, I hope my neighbour will be good enough to ask him how he is getting on with his farm, because he evidently does not know anything about incorporated institutions, but may be posted in farming for aught I know. The Superiors of the Jesuit and Oblat Orders know nothing about it, he says. Well, if they do not, they are very ignorant. It is really hard to speak kindly of men who will persist in proclaiming broadcast positive untruths.

Then as to the Cabinet minister at Ottawa. If he really said what priest Hand avers he said he ought to

be ashamed of himself. Such language would not have been allowed in the House of Commons; the Speaker would have called him to order. My advice to that honourable gentleman is to take a course in etiquette, so as to find more appropriate words, even if he wants to tell a story or to manifest his ignorance; let him do so in a more gentlemanly manner. In such a man, if he really sent that despatch, his ignorance is unpardonable. Fancy a Cabinet minister stating such an incorporation never took place. Of course I am crediting priest Hand with having received the despatches. I am not going to question him on that point. It would be a graceful act for those Superiors of the Jesuit Society and of the Oblats to tell us how many Jesuits there are. It would be a nice thing for them to make a return of how much land these Oblats are in possession of, and how much they paid for it. Let the Secretary of the Province of Manitoba ask these questions, and the answers would put him to shame, if the proper returns were made. Last Sunday evening, in Notre Dame church, Montreal, priest Daniel said "there was not a family in the country which prides itself on noble character which has not a son a Jesuit." They are more general than we have any idea of. If we are to take this priest's statement they are widespread throughout the country, and we know not who they are; yet they are our sworn enemies. We have the best right to banish such characters from our country, for it is neither right for me nor for my Catholic friends who are not Jesuits to be moving in society in the presence of such dangerous enemies as they are, through their oath and as they have exhibited in their past conduct. Priest Hand, last Sunday evening, gave a list of fifteen private bequests given to the Jesuits in the seventeenth

century. I do not, nor does a single writer that I am aware of, deny this. This is not the point we are touching, but it is a very convenient one for him to harp upon in order to avoid the right one. Let priest Hand tell his people that even these private gifts, like Crown property, were only in trust to the Jesuits and not their own. Besides these private gifts the Crown gave largely.

Britain conquered Quebec from France in 1759. After that conquest Quebec became British. What belonged to Louis XV. went by right of conquest into the hands of George III. His Majesty King George had a right to adminster these trusts and estates as it pleased him, whether they were crown trusts or private trusts. He gave the Jesuits time to wind up their affairs and sell all they could sell, and they sold much. Then he was generous enough, when some of them complained that they would be impoverished, to grant them a yearly annuity as long as they lived. Père Cazot, who died in 1800, was the last of those who had received the annuity from the British Government. By the conquest and the statutory laws of Great Britain the Jesuit Society was civilly disallowed by the very act of conquest. That I proved to you by the laws of the land in a former sermon. But to make it sure, in 1774 a Royal Imperial Decree was issued for their extinction and suppression. Now, the Roman Catholic Church could not become the civil custodian of these Jesuit estates, becuse it was not, and is not now, an incorporation in any country in the world. A people not incorporated cannot receive trusts. That is common sense. Some writers say that because these Jesuits were Catholics that their property should have fallen to the Church. I say in reply, the Church was not then, and is not now an incorporated body; hence, could not receive such

trusts. The Imperial decree was made necessary because on July 23, 1773, Pope Clement XIV. had taken away their spiritual authority and status, as far as he had power to do so, forever. I do not suppose he would tell an untruth intentionally, and priest Hand surely forgets himself when he says that the Bull of Suppression issued by Pope Clement did not include Canada. He has made a fearful mistake there, which I hope for his honour he will correct. The Bull has no country or territorial limitations, and Canada was not exempt from it. It was directed against the Order, as it says, in all parts of the world wheresoever it existed. Canada was then a part of the world, and is going to remain so to the end. How a man in the face of these facts can pervert history to suit his own ends, I am at a loss to know.

The present Order is a new one. It is not a continuation, nor a succession, excepting by numbers. Pius VII., in 1814, created a new order of Jesuits, which we may call No. 2. No. 1 had been dead long ago, both religiously and civilly. It had been without civil status, or dead, 114 years. Quebec takes hold of No. 2, created by Pius VII., and gives it a civil status. This is not the Order that existed long long ago, and it cannot by law make the first claim upon what No. 1 had. It is a wonder to me that some of these men don't make a claim upon some Jews for the thirty pieces of silver that Judas Iscariot threw down, and ask compound interest on it, for he must have a successor; and I have no doubt that some of our politicians would be willing to make a grant towards the same if the Jesuits should ask them. Priest Hand said, "Strong is the law of the nations in favour of the preservation of the Jesuits' estates." So strong, my dear sir, that none

of the seventy nations and countries from which they were expelled ever gave them back their property. Britain is the only one that ever gave them an annuity, and how ungrateful they have been! Do not talk so much like my name about these things, but let us have reason and truth.

Now, my friends, I have stated what I believe to be absolute truth. I am glad the agitation is going on, and I hope it will continue. I hope the result will be what we desire. Let us stand by the truth, by our rights. Let the disloyal man go under; let the truthful man live, and loyal citizens enjoy their just rights in this country. May God guide and direct us through it all. Amen.

ST. PATRICK AND IRELAND.

Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.—1 COR. x. 11.

HE is a wise man who always walks in the light of his own experience, and they are a wise people who take counsel from the past. A nation should not be guilty of forgetting to read correctly its own history. To please a class or party or sect history should not be falsified, for both the successes and failures of the past will help us to a clearer knowledge of the present, and better qualify us for duty and for action. I am sorry that in our beloved Canada some of our school books have been

trimmed to a modesty that does not teach the scholar the whole truth. What to me, as a Congregationalist, is the fact that the Pilgrims of New England were intolerant? What is it to me, standing in the increased light and charity of the close of the nineteenth century, if they appear as a band of persecutors, and as a narrow-minded and bigoted sect? If the thing be true, all right; whether it be Congregationalism or anything else. If you are going to write history, write it, and tell the whole story. Let the truth be written, and let it be taught. Facts, good or bad, if faithfully recorded, will serve as a wholesome lesson unto us. It is well enough to grow eloquent over the deep blue sea and the placid features of our beautiful lakes, but at the same time do not let us forget to buoy and mark the sunken rocks, sand bars and the other dangerous places. Do not forget to put beacon lights for the guidance of those who toil on these great waters. It is most necessary that the weaknesses and dangers of the past be faithfully recorded.

Why should our Roman Catholic friends become angry with us because we read and write and want taught the true history of their popes, their hierarchy, the Jesuits and the church? Why read and talk about the persecution of the pilgrims and then be condemned and mouth-gagged about the persecution and the vile and incestuous conduct of the Jesuits? Why do you venture to criticise my fathers as Congregationalists, and tell me to close my mouth when I turn to the enormities of a people of your faith? Tell the truth about both of them. That is the only fair and square way to do, and every man of us who wants to wince under the same, do so. If we believe the Roman historians, there never was on earth a sect so corrupt, so villainous, so

deceptive and so hypocritical. Does it not strike you as strange that anybody would undertake to defend a vile corporation like this—that is, if you believe Roman Catholic historians. I shall not quote from the Protestants, because I could keep you a week quoting from the others. If I believe the Roman Catholic historians, I would just as soon set up to defend the devil as to defend the Jesuits. Remember what I have told you aforetime. These Jesuits were expelled from over seventy states and countries, four-fifths of which were Roman Catholic; cursed and denounced as being hypocritical and corrupt by eleven popes; and finally, after full examination, and being fully convinced of their hellish spirit and satanic work, Pope Clement dissolved them. He says: "We do out of our certain knowledge and the fulness of our Apostolic power suppress and abolish the said Company, so that the name of the Company shall be, and is forever, extinguished and suppressed. Our will and pleasure is that our letters shall forever and to all eternity be valid, permanent and efficacious."

That is pretty good. I don't think you could get stronger language than that. I don't think you could extinguish a man or society in stronger terms than these; but in spite of this evidence—think of it—priest Flannery, of St. Thomas, priest Hand, of Toronto, and priest Whelan, of Ottawa, have actually had the audacity to stand forth as defenders of this corrupt society, and by so doing traduce their own Popes, defame their own church and belie their own historians. Shame on them. (Applause.) If these priests are right, then the others are wrong. If the others are right, then these priests are found false witnesses before God and before man. Anyway they are all Roman Catholics, so the lie and the libel is between them, and not with us, thank

the good Lord. Honestly, why should anybody think it strange that a Protestant Queen, a Protestant Government, a Protestant people, a Protestant country and a Protestant Empire should not believe in the Jesuits when a majority of the Roman Catholics themselves do not? Why does priest Hand ask me to be a believer in a sect condemned by his own people in a majority? He asks a very unreasonable thing, as any man will in a moment see. I had hoped that priest Hand, in his last Sunday evening's discourse, would have offset some of my arguments or given some fresh arguments in favour of the Jesuits. His whole discourse, however, I find, as far as reported, was an indictment against France, against Italy, against Spain, against Portugal and against Pope Clement, the latter of which he thinks was misinformed and unduly influenced. Too bad that these Roman Catholic countries had not more piety and sense, and that the infallible Pope Clement should have been so ignorant and so weak as pointed out by Father Hand. I would recommend a little more infallibility for the present Pope, because he might commit about the same error, and some priest in fifty years stand up to condemn him, for it is a serious thing to be condemning a man who is infallible. I hope priest Hand will clear himself of the perjury I charged him with last Sunday evening, or at least be manly enough to apologize. By his own words he made it necessary for me to defend myself, and in doing so I threw the stigma consciously, intelligently and knowingly on him, and it abides there until he removes it. I had said the Oblate Fathers were incorporated, and that among them were Jesuits. This he denied. I showed you a copy of the Bill of Incorporation, and I called your attention to the fact that you might find it in the Statutes of Canada of

1883. In a like false position my answer places the Provincial Secretary of Manitoba, the heads of the Oblates and Jesuits, and a Cabinet Minister of the Dominion Parliament. They, too, are in honour bound to repudiate what Priest Hand said, or prove it or apologize. Do you know what my own convictions are? I will tell you a secret. They are, that Father Hand misled these gentlemen in the way he put the question to them, and I believe it will turn out to be just so. However, we will wait another week and see what the reverend gentleman has got to say for himself.

Now, this being the 17th of March, which is St. Patrick's Day, we may appropriately turn our attention for a short time to look at Ireland and its patron saint. This island and people have had a strange and chequered history. As is natural and common wherever Roman Catholicism has had a good hold, it has been one of strife, of rebellions, of war, of discontent, and, with the masses, of ignorance and poverty. There is no exception to this rule in the whole world. Roman Catholicism, as the word "Rome" points out, is naturally a foreign religion and a foreign organization in Ireland. Roman Catholicism—why should not the Irish have a Christian Catholicism? What do they want with Roman Catholicism, which is a limited kind of schism, and is a limited Catholicism?

They would never have put that word in had they known how we would understand it in these latter days. No people in this world, according to their means and ability, have given more money, or sacrificed their liberty more freely to Rome than have the Irish Catholics. The See of Rome has drawn from that impoverished people, year after year, millions upon millions of money. It was indeed a sad day for England when the Romish

missionary, Augustine, entered it in 596; but sadder still, if we now measure backward in the light of events, for Ireland when Rome put her covetous and polluted feet on that pure green isle. In a little over fifty years, by their craft and hypocrisy, they had made great conquests in the south and west of that island. In the north they never made much headway, and never will, for they of the north are Danites, of the stock of Israel, true British brothers, and know more than to be slaves to Rome, to the Jesuits, to the devil, or anybody else. Thank God, there are a few Irishmen anyway who believe themselves equal to the Italian, and do not need to go by way of Rome even to purgatory, but who believe in the new and living way, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. That saves a great deal of trouble and lots of money, and I am surprised that any Irishman should want to go to heaven by the roundabout way of Rome.

No sooner had Rome gained power in Ireland than she set to work methodically to destroy the national church of that land, and to subjugate the temporal authorities. By her intrigues she pitted one chief against another, one provincial king against another, and finally in the south and west subjugated all to herself. She then undertook to destroy that beautiful Hebrew Temple at Tara, which had stood for some 900 years, one of the most brilliant buildings, perhaps never excelled but by Solomon's Temple in this world, in which sounded the harp of David in Tara's halls. It was the grandest centre of religion, poetry and science that the world had at that time. It was linked in history to the old church, to the old Hebrew people. Rome could not abide in its presence so she decreed its destruction, in accordance with which decree it was

cursed in 556 by St. Ruadham, and the people were forced to leave it, and to-night it lies buried in its own dust, and over its ruins I have walked myself. It will yet be uncovered and bring to light evidence that will condemn Rome for her cruelties of the past. Not only did they destroy the temple, but we must remember in connection with the temple and traditions of the people they had a sainted patriarch whom they adored, and also a festival occasion commemorative of him. In their language he was called *Ollam-Folla*, the biggest man Ireland ever had according to ancient history. This is the man who gave them liberty, education and religion 800 years before St. Patrick was born. These two words, *Ollam-Folla*, are Hebrew words in the Irish language. The ancient historians interpret the words and the man that he was a Hebrew prophet, and they called him by the common name, Jeremiah. Many of us in these latter days, through the light of prophecy see that Jeremiah, at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Palestine, when Zedekiah was dethroned, fled to Egypt, from which place he disappears, and a few years later a famous Hebrew prophet makes his appearance in the North of Ireland among the *Tuath-de-Danan*, or the people of the tribe of Dan. We have come to the conclusion that this St. Patriarch is none other than Jeremiah, a very good man to get for Ireland, and nobody should fight against him unless they have some better character to put in his place. Rome naturally wished to destroy this saint's influence and to attach it to herself, and so she took a Protestant by the name of Calpurnius and gave him a new name. This was long after he was dead, about 170 years, that they christened him St. Patrick instead of the sainted Patriarch, and said he was a Catholic saint, and the day set apart for

the celebration of the St. Patriarch they gave to St. Patrick—the 17th of March used to belong to the St. Patriarch. Of course if such a person as St. Patrick ever existed, probably there was, he belonged to the Church of Ireland as also to the Church of England, and was without doubt a Benjamite.

In not one of his writings (though they claim to have a few scraps of poetry and prayers) is there a single word about Roman Catholicism. Here is the opening sentence of Patrick's Confession: "I, Patrick, a sinner, the rudest and the least of all the faithful, and most contemptible to very many, had for my father Calpurnius, a deacon, a son of Pontitus, a Presbyter, who dwelt in the village of Baunavem Taberniæ; for he had a small farm hard by the place where I was taken captive." The word Rome is never mentioned until years after, when they put it in to suit their own ends; but the insertion is not correct. You may think it strange to put the name of St. Patrick in the place of Jeremiah. When Roman Catholic missionaries went to China they allowed the Chinese to retain their gods if they would only give them Catholic names. And so did the Jesuits with our Indians. Hence the poor Indian will swear by the gods of the Roman Catholics, having through lapse of time forgotten their original Indian names. You may think this strange. Yes, very strange, but it gives them power. Of the grand and noble work done by John Huss, the great Bohemian Reformer, no doubt all of you have read—how he stood forth against the abuses indulged in by the Romish Church. This grand Reformer they burned at the stake July 6th, 1415, casting his ashes into the Rhine. The people of Bohemia honoured him with a day of celebration, just as we honour the Queen's birthday, and the people of the

United States the birthday of George Washington. About 100 years after his death the Roman Catholic Church in Bohemia, by legislation, changed the name from John Huss to John Von Nepomuk, whom they claim as a Saint of their church, and now he has all the honours that used to be given to John Huss. If you were to go among the Bohemians to this day the name of John Huss is not mentioned, but rather John Von Nepomuk. Their object in thus changing the names is apparent.

Now, of the Roman Catholic Church there is no mention until in the fourth century, when the words were first written. Prior to that date they are not found in any manuscript or inscription or anywhere in this vast world. The term was invented hundreds of years after our Saviour lived on this earth. True there were Catholic Christian Churches in the world, in Asia, Africa, Europe and the British Isles. It would be equally as reasonable to speak of the churches of the first century as the Jerusalem Catholic Church, the Antioch Catholic Church, the London Catholic Church, the Tara Catholic Church, as to say the Roman Catholic Church. Will Priest Hand say when these words were first used?

Christianity was planted in England and Ireland in the first century, about the year 67. In England it took root at a place called Avalon, afterwards changed to Iniswirtren, and is now called Glastonbury. We know from history that King Lucius was a Christian, and founded the archbishoprics of London, York, Caerleon and Usk. When St. Augustine, the Roman Catholic missionary, landed in England in 596, there were at least seven bishops in the old English Church. The English Church was represented at the great Councils

in the first centuries, and stood equal to Rome, and there was no dispute ; whilst the Bishop of Rome claims to be Pope, there is no word of such a thing even before the fourth century. He sat as a bishop, just as the other bishops from the other countries. He might have been made chairman, just as some other bishops. The English bishops were represented in 314 at the Council of Arles in France. At this Council we find Bishop Ebarius of York, Restitutus of London, Adelfius of Caerleon and several others. They were present also at the Councils of 325 and 343. The Episcopal Bishop of Armagh in Ireland is the literal descendant of St. Patrick. He is the 110th man, and the chain has never been broken. · Ireland had its Church before the Roman Catholics came in. They are aliens, intruders, and ought to get out of it. Why do not these men take me up, and answer what I say? They dare not do it. They will insult me ; but that is not answering my statements. Yet they have the advantage of me, as every word I utter is printed and cannot vary.

A short time ago in England certain leases made over 999 years ago fell due, and the courts gave the property to the Church of England as the church. We will all admit that that church at certain times has been corrupt, but it has been the same church. Naaman when covered with leprosy is Naaman still, and when washed and clean is Naaman still. So the old Church of England is the church planted by the Apostle Paul, even in its worst forms of corruption or leprosy, and when it purged itself of the leprosy at the time of the Reformation, it was still the Church of England. The other came in from Rome, is a foreign affair and an intruder, and therefore has no special claims upon us.

The Roman hierarchy in Ireland and the effect of their doings is very tersely described by General Garibaldi, in his speech of September 1, 1871. He said: "That canker worm, the priest, not satisfied with desolating a greater portion of the continent of Europe, has fastened upon and is eating away one of the fairest countries of the United Kingdom." He was right. If Romanism and Jesuitism were banished from Ireland, in fifty years thereafter the island and the people would be one of the most prosperous and happy of nations on this earth. Some priests are always at some dirty and disloyal work.

Talk about Home Rule! Out of over 1,000 Protestant ministers in Ireland only eight were in favour of the Home Rule movement as proposed by Parnell. Every grand jury, every board of trade, and hundreds of the best Catholic families have pronounced against it, besides one and one-half millions of loyal Protestants; yet we have men here talking about Home Rule as wanted by a few priests. A certain measure of Home Rule will be granted to Ireland without doubt, as also to England, Scotland and Wales; but it will not be of the kind those disloyal priests want. To hear them talk you would suppose they had the whole of Ireland at their back, when, as the fact is, they have only about two counties in the whole country. Ireland was never so prosperous as she is now, and the people never had more money in the banks than at the present time. Land in the county of York here is dearer per acre for rent than it is in Ireland. There they raise more per acre and get a better price for it than we do here. In Ireland the landlord cannot fix his own rent; the tenant can have it fixed for him by the court. Then he can shirk it for four or five years, and cannot be put off for

a certain time ; yet he can sell his right and his improvements, and oftentimes can obtain more for them than the rent of the farm. Point me out a farmer in any part of this world who is so protected. You will have great difficulty in doing so. I can put a tenant out of my house much sooner than can be done in Ireland. Why, then, with the protection they have, should they grumble ? They have been taught to grumble. In an essay on " The Times," written by a barrister, the Rev. Father Rogers, a Roman Catholic priest, speaking at a meeting of Conservatives, held at Leominster, in England, in January, 1888, said : " They had heard a great deal about Ireland lately. I am qualified to speak about Ireland," said he, " and I do not hesitate to say that the farmers in that country enjoy advantages of which the agriculturists of either England or Scotland have never dreamed. What they want in Ireland is quiet and rest." This is a quotation from a Roman Catholic, and I always prefer to quote from their own followers, as to do so strengthens my argument very much.

I trust that in all our agitations we will remain good-natured and kindly disposed towards each other. Let the truth prevail. If any question arises, let it be debated in a Christian spirit, asking the Lord to guide and direct us. The Lord bless us. Amen.

GOD, THE QUEEN, AND THE POPE.

Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.—1 EPISTLE PETER II. 17.

THE Bible is full of wholesome advice governing the various relations we sustain toward God, toward our rulers and toward one another; and experience teaches us that national peace and prosperity can only be permanently secured by our acting in harmony with Gospel equality. The natural vanity of man renders it easy for him to claim, to seek and if possible to get distinction and authority from and over his fellow-man; and thus come to pass the strange and ridiculous assumptions of some church dignitaries and State autocrats. In the light of common sense, and from the standpoint of the brotherhood of man and the supreme sovereignty of God, the Pope with his claim is a moral monstrosity. Crowned and mitred, capped and gowned, belted and mantled, sandalled and jewelled, he sits in state on a throne actually claiming to be God's vicegerent on earth, and the successor and representative of the meek and lowly Jesus of Nazareth. You would not have the slightest idea who he was unless somebody told you. All this he wishes the rest of the brotherhood to acknowledge, and seal the same by kissing his big toe. In the presence of such claims, the sovereignty of our Queen, the supremacy of God, and the equality of the brotherhood of man are not safe and cannot be carried out. At the very best they can but hold a

secondary place. The duties we are exhorted to in the text cannot be practised and carried out through Roman Catholicism. The Pope and hierarchy may hold these claims in abeyance, and even do so for policy sake, but they are there all the same, and they will be put into force at any time when there is an opportunity of success, which opportunity of success will be at the time of our greatest stress and weakness. The very time we most need the united support of the brotherhood, is the very time that these latent and reserved powers would come into operation to destroy us. In favour of what I have said, history records their treachery in time of England's danger not once, but many times. It was a Pope gave the crown of King John to Louis; a Pope gave the crown of Elizabeth to the King of Spain; a Pope excommunicated King John, King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth; that is, as far as lay in his power. On the death of Queen Elizabeth, Pope Clement issued two Bulls, prohibiting any king or successor who would not swear to advance and defend the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain.

These claims are not simply confined to Popes, but even the priests claim equal power and authority in many directions, at least. Take the following, written by a Bavarian Roman Catholic priest, in a small pamphlet issued in 1872. He says; "We, the priests, are high above the governments, emperors, kings and princes of this world as the heavens are above the earth. Kings and princes of this world are as much beneath us as lead compared with the finest and purest gold. Angels and archangels are far beneath the priests, for we can forgive sin as God Himself, which faculty angels and archangels never possessed. We stand above the mother of God; for as she has given birth to Christ

only once, we priests produce and create him every day. Yea, the priest may be said to stand above God Himself, because He must be at their service at all hours, and in all places, and at our bidding, and at the act of consecration whenever made, must come down from heaven to serve us." Did you ever hear such language? If the Almighty were a priest, and He were to talk like that, there would be some sense in it, but for a poor, mortal man to utter such sentiments is beyond conception almost. "God has created," he goes on to say, "the world with the words, 'Let there be,' but we priests make God Himself with three words." Of course, he is reasoning correctly from their doctrines, and any one who believes their doctrines is obliged to believe just what he says, ridiculous and blasphemous as it is. Are such sentiments an honour to God? Will such sentiments produce a proper fear and reverence of God, or will it not have a natural tendency to transfer the fear that belongs to God to the priest, who is mightier than God? Will such sentiments help to unite the brotherhood of man, or will they tend to loyalty to the sovereign of a nation? Far be it from them; it is not in them to do any of these things. And so you find they carry out these sentiment whenever they dare. In Roman Catholic banquets, they seem very much to dislike honouring the Queen, by not giving her her rightful place in the first toast of the occasion. Whenever they do toast Her Majesty first, I am inclined to think that, in many cases, it is more a matter of policy than a genuine spirit of loyalty. Many times the last few years, to my knowledge, they have put the Pope first, and in case they durst not do so, they have pretended to have no toasts, as in the banquet given to Cardinal Taschereau on his late visit to Toronto. He

claims to be a prince of Rome and on such occasions to represent the Pope, the highest authority in the world, and the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy over kings, and queens and princes he must maintain, and so he did. They had no toasts, as they said, excepting "Our Guest"—literally putting him before Her Majesty. What is more remarkable, we had a number of weak-kneed Protestants who allowed such folly by their presence and silence, dishonouring our Queen and their country, ministers as they were. Some people are all the time crying out "Peace," and are willing to tolerate without protests such dishonourable conduct towards God, towards the Queen and towards the brotherhood of man. My cry is, Watch and be ready, for the treacheries of the past ought not to leave us unprepared in any time of the present.

I know men who are harmless and kind and companionable when sober, but when filled with whiskey they are none of these things; but very meddlesome, troublesome and dangerous. So I know many Roman Catholics who are quiet and peaceable; but neither they nor we can know what they would do if a war should break out in our midst and the Pope should absolve them from their allegiance to Her Majesty, as Popes have done many a time in the past. What would the poor Roman Catholic do? Would he go against the Holy Father or against the Queen? Nine out of every ten would go against the Queen. These things, I have said, the Popes have done in the past, and, as they are infallible, they might do so again. Neither our Catholic friends nor we have a right to be exposed in this manner—by a foreigner especially. It is all right in times of peace and prosperity, but I am speaking of a supposed time of danger and division in our land. We

have many utterances from them that will enforce what I have said. I will quote you one. Mr. Sutton is the organizer and lecturer of the Land League societies in Canada. He has told more truth than even his friends desired he should tell. He spoke twice in Toronto some three years ago. In one of his addresses he was so violent and disloyal that none of our city journals—just think of it, none of our city papers—dared to publish what he said. A Catholic friend who was present told me personally that he was ashamed of the language that was used on that occasion, and more so that some fellow-citizens of the same faith should cheer such outrageous attacks. He was more favoured when he visited the city of Ottawa, for one of the papers gave us the following as a part of one of his speeches. Listen to it: "Wait until England is locked in her death grapple with her enemies, and then you may with ease and safety plunge your dagger into her heart. Irishmen stand ready to stab England in her back at the first opportunity, and it was folly, and worse than folly, to say that the Irish are loyal to the Empire as at present constituted. No one could tell how soon England would be engaged in a European war, and in such a case, if she did not grant every iota of the demand made by Ireland, she would have to double her troops in that country." This is the sort of language these men can use, forecasting to you and me how necessary it is for us to be united and banded together so that when danger comes we will know who are our foes, and how to keep them quiet. The Jesuit is, of course, sworn sacredly to persecute to the uttermost all Protestants and schismatics. Now, I am a Protestant and a schismatic from his church, and intend to remain so.

The Pope claiming sovereignty over us spiritually and temporally, and a majority of the laity waiting to stab our country in the back if she should ever be seriously engaged in war, makes this Jesuit question a very serious one to every man and woman in Canada, both Protestant and Catholic. Yet, in face of all this, some of our timid, cringing Protestants say to me: "Hush, you may offend these people, and raise religious animosity." All right! I wonder why they don't give us a chance. So long as they get what they want, it is not probable they will say very much; but the moment we begin to ask for what we want they tell us to keep quiet. They are always ready to fight. Whether it is natural to the religion they profess, or not, I cannot say; but a Roman Catholic has no compunction in sawing off the tail of a horse, maiming an animal, burning down a house, or even committing murder.

Last Sunday evening when Father Chiniquy was lecturing in Shaftesbury Hall we are told a young woman arose in the congregation and cried out as she passed to the door, "You old turncoat, you ought to be burned at the stake." This poor, deluded servant girl had the spirit of the doctrine in her. That is what they would do to Chiniquy and some of us had they but the power. It is in the religion, is this spirit.

In my opinion, any man who could and would blow England up would get a mighty big indulgence from the Pope, and I am sure he would get a free pass through purgatory, and take a seat with Guy Fawkes and the other notables who tried to perform that feat but failed. Of these worthy scoundrels, Guy Fawkes & Co., Cardinal Manning says: "On earth they wore the garb of felons; in heaven they stand arrayed in white, and

crowned. Here they were arraigned in the dock as malefactors; there they sit by the throne of God." Don't you think if some fellows could successfully blow England up, that they would get as good a place as the scoundrels of whom Cardinal Manning speaks?

Wherever Rome has had power she has used it. That is why I say that every Roman Catholic priest in this country should be compelled to take an oath of loyalty to the sovereign, the country and its laws; because while they hold these latent forces and powers we are always in danger, not knowing when they will put them into operation. Let us take an instance. Pope Innocent III., knowing the English were much divided, issued a bull disposing of King John's crown, and absolving all the people from their allegiance to the King. He ordered that the churches be closed, the dead be unburied, the Sacraments suspended. This interdict lasted for six years and three months. People buried their dead in their own gardens, in ditches and on the highways until poor King John had to yield the contest or the whole country, by fever and disease, would have been destroyed from the corrupting of the dead above the ground. When John, however, had submitted, in a short time after, the people rose in their might, and in 1215 forced from the King the great Magna Charta, and so hurled back the bull of the Pope, telling him that they were free men. And we are their children. Then let us prove worthy of our sires, and be men ourselves. It is better for us to meet these encroachments in their infancy than in years to come. The Pope, after this charter was granted, issued a bull annulling it, which led to another war, in which the people were victorious. Give Rome liberty, and immediately the hierarchy abuse it; hence in times past it was found necessary to

deprive them of certain liberties and rights. Many, not understanding, look upon the thing as intolerant. The reason is, the Church invariably interfered by its bulls, decrees, and nullified or modified the laws of the land. The Roman Catholics may be said not to have been fully emancipated in England until 1867. Prior to that time no Roman Catholic could serve on a jury, for instance. Why keep him off a jury? He ought to be kept off Just as soon as they were fully emancipated, which took place in 1867, as I have said, the Pope, in October, 1869, two years after they had this liberty, issued a bull in which excommunication is denounced against any one suing a priest. Just think of this. Let a priest be arrested for any guilt and brought before a court for trial with a mixed jury of Protestants and Catholics. Which way are these Catholics going, whether the man be guilty or not? Are they going to condemn the priest, and go to hell themselves, or set the priest free, and get free of purgatory? They are going to do the latter. It is not possible for one Catholic out of 100 to be true and faithful to the evidence in England with such a law. Some people still say, Why deprive people? I ask, Why give them rights which they cannot rightfully use? I would be very sorry to be tried before a mixed jury of that kind. The Hon. Mr. Gladstone has well said: "Rome requires a convert to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

With the aims and claims of the Pope, the Jesuits and the Roman hierarchy, it seems to me our duty is clearly defined. In spite of our denominationalism, in spite of our party politics, it does seem to me that every man and woman should stand up for the truth of equality, for the brotherhood, for the fear of God, for the

honour of our Queen, irrespective of our sects, or races, or parties. At the next elections, both local and general, every candidate ought to be pledged on this point. No man, whatever he may be, whether Independent, Tory or Grit, should be given the suffrages of the people unless he will resist the encroachments of Jesuitism. This is fair to our party leaders. We blame them for not doing certain things; but will we sacrifice our individual votes. If not, then we cannot consistently blame them; we are forever debarred from criticising any government if we will not sacrifice our votes.

Evidently the Pope has our political parties by the ear with a strong pull. I would like to know this: Why did not the leader of the Conservative party during the late session propose a set of resolutions sympathizing with their Protestant friends in Quebec, and protesting against the Jesuit Bill and their incorporation? It seems to me that such a resolution would have come with as much grace from that side of the House as the resolution of sympathy and exhortation in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, sent by the Liberals of the Provincial Parliament to England some few years ago. I was at a loss for a reason for the conduct of the Conservative party in this last session until I got the secret which I will tell you. Such a resolution would have broken Mr. Mowat's Ministry to fragments, for hardly a man would have dared to vote against it, for they are all from Ontario. Why did not Mr. Meredith take this chance to upset Mr. Mowat's Government? The successor to my late friend, Archbishop Lynch, is going to be the man I picked out some months ago, Bishop Walsh, of London, who is a Conservative. When he is installed here he has promised to give the Province over into the hands of the Conservatives. Thanks. I hope

at the next election they will be smashed to a thousand pieces. I am a party man myself, a very strong one, yet I withheld my vote at the last general election but one, when such trickery was going on, and I would withhold it forever rather than either party should fall prostrate at the feet of an archbishop. What I say I do, and trust the Lord will guide me and thousands of others throughout Ontario to do the right. The power is in our hands, and we can carry the day. Of course if it is resisted many votes will be thrown on the side of the Third Party, which is not to be despised. There must be a third party or a liberation of the old parties; one or the other must come. Every man of common sense knows that.

The battle is raging not only in Canada, in speeches, in discussion, in resolutions and in legislation, but also in Great Britain. From one end to the other they are forming what they call Protestant Leagues, and are now considering the reasons for banding together to resist the encroachments of Rome. It is so in every State of Europe. They are all uneasy, all fretful, all uncertain. It is so in the United States, especially in Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, Illinois, Wisconsin and California. It is the most troublesome and dangerous question the United States have to deal with. It is the most troublesome and dangerous question we have to handle in this Dominion.

The Jesuits are working all along the line in Europe. They will foment war, and out of the wreck of that war, as the prophets have told us, will rise the temporal power of the Pope. He will once more be clothed with power among the kings of the earth. This is sure to come, and so what I preach for in Canada is, that when the evil shall come it shall bear upon us lightly. He

will live and rule for several years, and, as the prophet points out, he will make an alliance with Anti-Christ for the destruction of Great Britain, her one great enemy for hundreds of years. He will make an alliance with Russia and the mighty forces will go to meet our own fatherland in the great battle of Armageddon. But God will come to our help, and they will be wiped out of existence. Then we will hear of a Pope no more, nor of a Roman Catholic in the whole world. That is a little glimpse into the future which will come as sure as you and I are here.

As I have said, the Jesuits are working all along the line. The Jesuits Estates Bill is not the great point we should battle against. If the Bill of Incorporation were annulled the Estates Bill would be of no avail. What we should fight against is the Bill of Incorporation. As long as they are a legal society in the Province they have a right, as a Provincial Government, to grant them the money. They had no right, however, to appeal to the Pope. The $400,000 does not settle it at all. It is given simply for the privilege of allowing Quebec to sell the lands. It is not even part of the price of the lands, for if they sell very well they will want a little more than the $400,000. Then how often we overlook the Laprairie Common, which has been deeded over to the Jesuits in fee simple, a beautiful piece of property at the foot of Lachine Rapids, Montreal, the very barrack ground of our conquering troops in the years gone by. Here in time past were the King's mills, his farms, his post, a piece of land that really belonged to the Indians. No spot more sacredly and intimately connected with British institutions in Canada. The Jesuits have got that fine land, worth more than the $400,000, and who is saying anything about it? We are nibbling at a thing

that is half right and is half wrong. The whole of that Laprairie Common was granted to the Huron Indians, of Lorretto, by the King of France in 1651. The Jesuits therefore have not the first title to it; yet the Government have taken it from the poor Indians and deeded it over to the Jesuits. Thus we are constantly being deprived and defrauded by this insidious foe. We must be alive to our duty, and faithful in the discharge of it. When the time comes ask the man who seeks your suffrage what he intends to do on the question. Be sound and clear, whatever party you support. The Lord bless us. Amen.

BOOKS BY THE REV. JOSEPH WILD, D.D.

FOR SALE AT THE OFFICE OF "THE CANADIAN ADVANCE," 10½ ADELAIDE STREET EAST, TORONTO.

TWENTY SUNDAY MORNING SERMONS. (New)
Bound in cloth..... $1 00

THE TEN LOST TRIBES.
Bound in cloth..... 1 00

HOW AND WHEN THE WORLD WILL END.
Bound in cloth..... 1 00

TALKS FOR THE TIMES.
Bound in cloth..... 1 00
Paper cover 50

THE ORIGIN AND SECRETS OF FREEMASONRY. 10
CANADA AND THE JESUITS..... 25
CABINET PHOTOGRAPH OF DR. WILD..... 25

The Canadian Advance

Is the only non-sectarian religious weekly in Canada. Its special features are:—Authorized Verbatim Repo[illegible] of the Sunday evening Sermons of the Rev. Dr. Wild; The International Sabbath School Lesson, by Hon S. H. Blake; Dr. Wild's Answers to Correspondents; The Rambler; short, crisp Editorials; valuable Contributed Articles, and a choice miscellany.

It is the most successful religious weekly in Canada, and has readers in every part of the world. $1 a year; 50 cents for six months; 25 cents for four months' trial trip.

Address,

CANADIAN ADVANCE,
10½ ADELAIDE STREET EAST,
TORONTO, CANADA.

BX
1767
.W5

Wild, Joseph, 1834-1909.
Canada and the Jesuits :